CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

No. 4. JULY, 1916. Vol. VI.

IN MEMORIAM.

The Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies.

On May 18th there occurred in London the death of one to whom many English Churchmen looked up with veneration and gratitude. We do well, when our benefactors leave us, to review their lives, and to recall the lessons they taught us. It will not therefore seem out of place if the writer of these lines endeavours to acknowledge some of the debts he owes to the remarkable man who has just passed away.

The Rev. John Llewelyn Davies was born in 1826, and had consequently exceeded, on the day of his death, by more than 20 years, the term which the Psalmist has fixed for the normal life of man. After a distinguished career at Trinity College, Cambridge, he was ordained in London, and became at the age of 30 Vicar of Christ Church, Marylebone, a position which he held for 33 years. In 1889 he was presented by his college to the living of Kirkby Lonsdale, where he remained until his retirement in 1908. He had thus completed in these two positions 52 years of continuous intellectual and administrative work. For, scholar and thinker though he was, he recognized that his first duty was towards those to whom he had been expressly called to minister.

When he left London for his Westmoreland parish he received a remarkable testimony to the influence he had exercised. A letter was addressed to him, signed by some 700

names, in which the signatories, among whom were many persons of high eminence in Church and State, expressed their grateful admiration for his "unselfish devotion to measures of practical improvement;" "for the moderation, independence and charity he had shown throughout his career;" "for the manner in which he had combined a clear and firm assertion of Christian truth with a generous appreciation of all earnest thought and feeling;" "for his maintenance of high ideals;" "and for his habitual sympathy with rich and poor alike."

His work indeed, while in London had made his name a very familiar one through the whole country. His sermons were widely read, while his contributions to magazines, and his letters to the *Times* on religious and social questions had a marked influence upon public opinion. The most famous controversialists of the day recognized him as a worthy antagonist. John Stuart Mill spoke of him as a man with whom it was a pleasure to engage in controversy. His criticisms upon the work of the Salvation Army moved Huxley to extol the warmth of his philanthropy, and to profess implicit reliance upon his competency and fairness. Although his predominant tastes were those of the scholar and thinker, there were many institutions and enterprises with which his name, when he left London, had become inseparably connected. He was one of the members of the first London School Board. He took part with Kingsley and "Tom" Hughes in teaching classes in the Working Men's College, an institution—the first of its kind—which he had helped his friend Frederick Denison Maurice to establish. He was for a time principal of Queen's College, Harley Street, which Maurice had founded for the better education of women.

Surprise has often been expressed that a man so widely known and justly venerated should have been allowed to remain throughout his life in the comparatively-speaking obscure position of a parochial incumbent. Perhaps this is not altogether to be regretted. Worldly advancement is so often regarded as the sole criterion of success that it is well

there should be men and women in all walks of life to remind us of the inadequacy of any such measure. The Church of England may be proud of her parish priests. Among them we can count a great and goodly company whose authority is the more impressive because it is obviously derived not from the dignity of high office, but from the excellence of sterling character, and the worth of disinterested personal achievement.

It is in Davies' sermons that we find, as we might expect, the fullest disclosure of his mind. He is often spoken of as a disciple in theology of Frederick Denison Maurice. To many readers, however, he seems to have an advantage over Maurice through the fact that his meaning is never doubtful. Maurice frequently needs an interpreter. His thought is elusive. We are never quite sure that the writer is not putting upon his words a meaning to which we have not the key. No such ambiguity occurs to us in the sermons of Davies, although the general tone and manner of treatment may remind us of Maurice. The thought moves along by natural and easy steps. The language, although always elevated and never conversational, is simple and direct. There are few illustrations, and while the preacher has obviously ample resources at his disposal, quotations except from Scripture are almost as rare with him as they are with Newman.

He had formed a distinct idea of the aim of the sermon and its limits. Its object, he perceived, was to connect the highest truth with every-day life.

> "Why do people think it good for them to be perpetually hearing sermons? What is the secret of the influence of sermons such as it is? In what does their virtue consist? Chiefly, I think, and most universally in this: That they strike the unseen chords which connect together the highest truths and our common life. A very commonplace finger may have just the power to touch those chords. It is a great mistake, in estimating the influence of sermons, to think only of the sermons. The hearers contribute more to the effect than the preacher. . . . . Every hearer has a human history of his own. He has his trials, his perplexities, his reasons for joy and sorrow, his causes of fear; he has his sins and his struggles with sin. These particulars are not known to the preacher; but they make all the difference in the effect of his sermon. I suspect that if each one of us were able to look

back over his church-going experience, and to fix upon the sermons which have come home to him most, and in which he has seemed with the greatest awe and conviction to hear God speaking to him, those sermons would not be what others would agree to call the most remarkable or impressive which he has heard, but those which he has happened to hear at critical moments in his own personal history. The preacher may be saying something which passes as mere commonplace through the ears of almost all the congregation; but there may be one heart the soil of which God has Himself prepared to receive what is spoken as seed from heaven." [1]

Taking this view of preaching he felt constrained to restrict himself in his sermons to the universal human needs, and the universal remedies.

"There would be a certain attraction to preachers as well as to some of their hearers in greater variety. But we remember that we have to speak to a certain number of our fellow creatures, who might be more or less interested to hear something new, but who are all, as we know,—rich or poor, learned or ignorant, moving much in the world, or hardly ever going out of their own houses,—exercised by the greatest and deepest of human experiences. They all know what it is to sin, to be tempted, to be disappointed. They all stumble because they are in darkness, they all want the light of life. When I remember this, I say here are the great universal needs, and I ask, must they not be met with the great universal helps? There is variety in the luxuries of life, hardly in its necessaries." (*o.c.* p. 217).

Although he limited himself thus rigorously in his choice of subjects, and shrank from anything approaching levity in the pulpit as much as Cowper's ideal preacher would have done, he seldom failed to interest and move his congregation. To the stray worshipper who came expecting eloquence of the conventional kind he was no doubt dull.

"'How dull sermons are,' he imagines someone saying, 'compared with the brilliant compositions which may be read in the newspapers.' Yes, but I am pretty sure most of you would rather hear sermons than have those brilliant compositions read to you. And this is not because you are darkened and enslaved by superstition, but because you know what you really want. . . . You want to go away from church, if by God's grace you may be so blessed, with more faith, more assurance, a clearer vision of what is right, a more resolute purpose to do it." (*o. cp.* 218).

Indeed when we charge a sermon or a book with being dull we may mean only that the preacher or the writer is interested

[1] *The Gospel and Modern Life*, p. 213. Macmillan & Co., 1869.

in something which does not interest us. It may well be, however, that the fault is ours and not his. The subject dealt with ought to interest us and would if we could only see its bearing upon the things for which we do care. In any case it is well that there should be speakers and writers who will not sacrifice truth to epigram, nor think it necessary to rivet the attention of their listeners or readers by trivial anecdotes and irrelevant personal reminiscences.

The subjects of some of these sermons have indeed no longer the interest or urgency they had when they were preached midway in the reign of Queen Victoria. The great majority, however, of those which have been published deal with the abiding questions and perplexities of Christian experience. The doctrine of the universal depravity of human nature is examined with careful discrimination. The advantages and disadvantages of competition are weighed in a just balance, and the consistency of our competitive system of education with Christian belief is considered with convincing candour. The nature of Christian saintliness is dealt with in a sermon on the Lives of the Saints which recalls the memorable discourse of Mark Pattison on this ever-suggestive subject. The nature of the conscience is investigated in a sermon which we should all do well at this moment to read and read again.

Such were the subjects with which Davies was in the habit of dealing Sunday by Sunday before a congregation of some 600 intelligent men and women who came from all quarters of London to profit by his teaching. Occasionally he would preach on political or social subjects which engaged public attention at the moment, and which had a direct religious significance, such as the disestablishment of the Irish Church, or the proposal, which has since become law, to legalize marriage with the sister of a deceased wife. No one who heard or reads these sermons will ever again be tempted to think or say that the pulpit is not the place for politics. When political questions are dealt with, as they are here, in a manner

which lifts them out of the atmosphere of party controversy, and places them in the solemn light of the spiritual world, we see the preacher making a worthy use of one of his greatest opportunities.

Davies often insisted that a religious belief or practice was not justified by the fact that it promoted religion. The further question, he thought, should always be asked: What is the religion which is thus furthered? is it true or false religion?

> "It may be the duty of the followers of Christ to contend against the spread of religion. . . . The adversaries of St. Paul were very religious; they held the civil authority in most religious contempt; they appealed to men in the name of supernatural sanctions to take trouble and do what was disagreeable to them. Yet St. Paul declared that they reduced his Gospel to a nullity, and he never tired of beseeching his converts to beware of allowing themselves to be brought into a religious bondage."[1]

To enforce this truth he preached a series of four sermons, in which he dealt with some practices or tendencies which might easily, as he thought, become instruments for the propagation of false religion. One of the sermons was on the subject of confession, and in it he points to what has always seemed to the writer of these lines the greatest difficulty besetting any real verbal confession of sin :—

> "Does anyone who at all understands human nature, or who reflects upon the processes of his own mind, believe that to turn one's sinfulness inside out is even practicable in such a sense or degree as to make it desirable to attempt it? . . . All the crossing and blending of thoughts, and feelings, and motives which constitute the real inward life of a human soul disappear when a particular confession is put into words. No doubt it is possible to say with truth, 'I have been guilty of such and such an act,' or even more, 'I know that I deliberately harboured and cherished such a passion or desire;' and confession, it may be presumed, generally consists of acknowledgments like these. But if it stops there, it will be felt by the earnest soul to be superficial. If we want God's absolution, we want it to penetrate much more thoroughly than can be done by a mere striking of certain acts out of the reckoning." (*o.c.*, p. 39).

At the same time he was not unmindful of the cases where verbal confession may be a welcome solace to the sin-burdened soul.

[1] *Warnings against Superstition*, p. 3. Macmillan & Co., 1874.

"A sinner may have been guilty, recently or long ago, of some transgression which has escaped the eye of the world, and which has had grievous consequences. If he has been touched by the awful grace of God, this sin will probably start up to accuse him. It may be then most fit, most necessary, that he should yearn to unburden himself of this sin, and that he should welcome the open ear of the priest or clergyman, and crave the comfort of express absolution." (*o.c.* p. 45).

So being dead he yet speaketh.

"Death is the passage from the visible world into the invisible; but what we most surely know about the invisible world is that Christ is there and the Father, and that spiritual communion may link those who are in the flesh with invisible beings. No progress of civilization or of scientific knowledge can avail in the slightest degree to make bereavement more tolerable. The happier our lot is in this world, and the more closely we are drawn to others, the more grievous must it be, that the loved companion should become the prey of the enemy. But there is real consolation for those who have come to feel naturalized in the heavenly commonwealth. They may reasonably cherish thoughts of re-union with those who have gone before them; or if at times they cannot help admitting how vain it is to speculate with any precision about the conditions of so different a life, they can at least cast themselves confidingly on the grace of Him who visits and is mindful of such unworthy creatures as the sons of men."[1]

J.G.

Captain the Rev. Lancelot Raimes.

By the death of Lancelot Raimes, who fell in France on the first of June, the Church militant has lost a devoted son, and the Churchmen's Union an enthusiastic and self-sacrificing member.

Captain Raimes was educated at the Leys School, to whose manly Christian tone he owed much. Later he entered Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1909, obtaining a second class in the Mediaeval and Modern Languages Tripos. He then spent a year at Ripon Clergy College, and was ordained in 1911 in the St. Alban's Diocese, becoming curate to the Rev. William Manning, Rector of

[1] *The Christian Calling*, p. 310. Macmillan & Co., 1875.

Chipping Barnet. There he served most usefully and happily until the outbreak of the war.

When *Yesterday, To-day, and For Ever*, our Liberal Churchman's parish magazine was founded, he very unselfishly became co-editor and contributed a number of excellent articles during the brief year of its existence.

Mr. Raimes' wide acquaintance with the best modern literature and his knowledge of how to use it, made him a helpful modern preacher, but what served him in even better stead in his sacred office, was his sweetness of disposition, his unaffected simplicity of manner, his whole-hearted devotion to the welfare of those with whom he was brought into contact. His Rector, whose heart he won, writes in warm appreciation of his parish work, and with something more than appreciation of the worker:—

> "In the parish of Chipping Barnet he did good work, especially among the young men, that will long be remembered with thankfulness. But he will live in the hearts and minds of all who knew him more by what he was than even by what he did. Everyone loved Raimes. He was cheery and bright and good. He was like a breath of God's mountain air. People felt that he was a man that happened to be a parson, and not a parson who happened to be a man, and that his goodness came from contact with a Source that he never talked about, and yet no one could ever doubt what that Source was.
>
> "In 1914, when he was away on a holiday, the Colonel of the 5th Durham Light Infantry, in which Raimes had held a commission previous to his ordination, asked him to conduct the funeral of the first man who had died since the outbreak of war. When the coffin was brought to the graveside, Raimes found that the dead man was the one who had taken his place in the battalion, and upon the coffin was the sword that had been his own. For Raimes that was enough. It was a call; and he was 'not disobedient unto the heavenly vision.'
>
> "For twenty months he was training men at home, and although not a Chaplain but a combatant, he was often asked to conduct services and was always ministering to the spiritual welfare of his men. Then, after three weeks at the front, came the news, very brief, very sad, very splendid—'Sniped; shot in the head; died ten minutes later, never regained consciousness.'
>
> "We have not *lost* a friend in Christ's crusade against the devil; a soldier of Christ has been promoted. We offer our prayerful sympathy to his family; we ask that we may have grace to follow his good example; and we comfort one another with these words: *Sed miles . . . et pro patria.*"

THE TWO GOSPELS.

There are two Gospels in the New Testament.

The first is the Gospel of Galilee. The Gospel of Galilee was the Gospel which caused multitudes to come to Jesus. It was the Gospel which won the publican and the prostitute. It drew Matthew from the custom house, Peter from his nets, Zacchaeus from the sycamore tree, and the woman who was a sinner from the streets. It was the Gospel which sought to bring men near to God, and to bring men near to one another for it is the Gospel of the Love of God, and the Gospel of the Service of Man. Its charter is the Sermon on the Mount; its prayer "Our Father;" its liturgy,* pure and undefiled, "To visit the orphans and widows in their affliction, and to keep oneself unspotted from the world." It is a Gospel which is very simple, very wide, very deep, very practical, and so high as almost to be unattainable.

This was the Gospel which roused the hate and anger of the guardians of contemporary traditional religion and ecclesiastical order. The Pharisee and the Sadducee beheld in this Gospel of Galilee the enemy of all they prized; Jewish particularism, Jewish sacerdotalism, Jewish ritualism, Jewish traditionalism, Jewish legalism, were all undermined by it. Therefore the Teacher of it must die and the heresy be stamped out. So He died, and what became of His Gospel of Galilee? Before that question can be answered, something must be said about the second Gospel in the New Testament.

The second Gospel in the New Testament is the Gospel of Jerusalem. It is not so much a Gospel of Jesus as a Gospel about Jesus. Nevertheless it appears to have originated with Jesus, although it is not clear that He ever called it a Gospel, and He certainly never preached it publicly. So far as He taught it, He taught it in secret and towards the close of His ministry. This makes it doubtful as to quite how much of it is His own and how much is the interpretation of His early disciples. The tradition is however well supported that

* *Θρησκεία.*

records that He first affirmed it in part to Peter and the apostles at Caesarea Philippi shortly before the last journey to Jerusalem. Thereafter it was hinted at in enigmatic sayings; it was symbolised by the triumphant entry on Palm Sunday; it was enshrined in the parable of the Vineyard-keepers and the Heir; it was confessed by Jesus *in camera* before the Sanhedrin. It was the ostensible cause of His death; and it was published in the title set over His head on the Cross: "This is Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews."

This Gospel of Jerusalem proclaimed that Jesus was the Messiah predicted by Prophets and Psalmists and Apocalyptists; that He must of necessity be rejected and slain; and that He would shortly return with Divine Power and angelic hosts to judge mankind.

This younger Gospel seized upon the imagination of the infant Church. It was developed greatly by St. Paul. The atoning death, the triumphant resurrection, the celestial exaltation, the almost immediate return in catastrophic judgment were the cycle of convictions which kept the primitive Christian in a fervour of expectation and other-worldliness. In consequence the Gospel of Galilee with its calm belief in a Heavenly Father and its strong emphasis upon human brotherhood and brotherliness, fell into a secondary place. In the early days, however, there was still a close connection between the two Gospels, and St. John strove with wonderful skill to link them together; but as the centuries went by they seemed to grow further and further apart. The Gospel of Galilee remained the same, but the Gospel of Jerusalem underwent many strange changes. It became the Gospel of Nicaea and then the Gospel of Trent and the Gospel of Geneva—and how much of the Gospel of Jesus remained in these Gospels is a question for expert theologians to decide—but to judge by their works the percentage of original Gospel was not very high.

As for the Gospel of Galilee, although the official Church ignored it, Christian people like St. Francis of Assisi and

St. Vincent de Paul and Elizabeth Fry made it their supreme Gospel, yet all the while anyone who really knew anything of theology knew quite well it was not "the Gospel." "The Gospel" was that of Jerusalem or Nicaea or Trent or Geneva.

The Church's leaders were ready to admit that the Gospel of Galilee was not without its uses. It did well enough for humble people in daily life, but for purposes of ecclesiastical polity and everlasting salvation, what was essential was the Gospel of Jerusalem. And so, if we may pass from history to allegory, the Gospel of Jerusalem, and the Gospel of Galilee lived together in a fine house called "Ecclesia," in the Rue de la Monde, and the younger sister acted the fine lady, and sat in the drawing-room and played the piano, and did fancy work, and was exceedingly clever and attractive, and possessed fine artistic sensibilities. If you were on good terms with her you might come to the house whenever you liked, and have your meals there too, and you need not trouble at all about being on good terms with the elder sister, for she had become a mere household drudge, and never came into the drawing-room except to wait. However, she was good enough at making fires, and doing cleaning, and providing meals. People who came to the back door with provisions and coals might talk to her, but her friends were not the sort of people to allow upstairs. It must be confessed too that she would hardly have done for upstairs, and its visitors. The only beauty she possessed was beauty of character; she had no taste in dress. But perhaps her greatest defect was that she had no sense of proportion, and so in the social world she was bound to be a failure. However, so long as she remembered her natural place, and did not give herself airs, but kept well in the background, she was quite welcome to stay and make herself useful; and her younger sister upstairs used now and again to speak very nicely about her to fashionable visitors, and say she was a good sort, and she hardly knew what she would do without her. That was the relation of the two Gospels at the time when the Great War broke out. Since then things have somewhat

changed. When that dreadful accident happened just opposite the front door, the Gospel of Galilee, tucked up her skirts and scuttled up the area-steps, and picked up the injured and carried them inside and attended to them in all sorts of ways, and her sister, the Gospel of Jerusalem, sat in the bow-window and said: "How very sad it all is, and yet I was always sure they would have an accident unless they attended to what I told them. As for my sister, the Gospel of Galilee, I fear she is forgetting herself sadly. She never so much as asked my leave, and now she seems to behave as though she, and not I, were mistress of the house." So the Gospel of Jerusalem got up rather slowly from her sofa, and in a very dignified fashion went round to see the injured, and told them in nice ornamental phrases to remember their manners and not to forget the proprieties, but what they replied—I am glad to say in most cases *sotto voce*—may not be printed in this magazine.

And now a lot of people are asking, not—Which is the *true* Gospel?—to answer that question involves an appeal to the theologians, and no sensible person ever wants to do that if he can help it, because their answers are so intricate and technical—but, Which is the most *useful* Gospel? By which they mean the most useful Gospel whether for ordinary everyday life or for life in days of stress and strain and pain and danger, and not unnaturally the general verdict of the man in the street—especially in the street where the accident happened—is that the Gospel of Galilee is the Gospel for him. He says he has been thinking so for a long time past, but that the unselfishness and heroism and simple faith of the non-church-going classes have shewn him that his surmise is correct. And now in some cases even the fashionable acquaintances of the Gospel of Jerusalem, *alias* Nicaea, Trent and Geneva are beginning to come round to his opinion. Perhaps it will not do them or the world any harm, but it will probably lead to some alteration in the domestic arrangements of "Ecclesia," Rue de la Monde.

THE OUTFIT OF A MODERN CHURCHMAN.

By the Rev. W. A. Cunningham Craig, M.A., Vicar of St. Sepulchre's, Holborn Viaduct, E.C.

VII.—His Gospel.

There is a criticism often brought against the modern Churchman to the effect that, however strong his position may be on purely intellectual grounds, it fails when it is brought to the test of practical life. It does not produce the same results as those which have been produced by older methods of presenting the Christian faith. It compares unfavourably in this respect both with what may be described as the Catholic or the Evangelical standpoints. It does not make the same successful appeal that they did to the human heart. It has not the converting power which they can still show. It cannot meet the deeper problem of human sin or provide a remedy for the diseases of the soul. The modern Churchman may see clearly enough the weak points in the position both of the Evangelical and the Catholic, but, when all is said and done, they still possess a secret which he lacks. They exercise an influence upon the mass of mankind which he has never acquired. They can point to results far more numerous and more striking than any which he can show. They are doing the real work of Christ, while he is only talking about it. In a word these other types of the Christian faith have a Gospel for a sinful, suffering world, while he has none. That is a criticism which it is impossible to ignore. If the modern Churchman cannot meet it in some way, if he cannot show that he is able to bring a message of cleansing and strength, of peace and reconciliation to the world, that in fact he has a Gospel, then his whole position has been fatally undermined. The rest of his outfit will be useless unless he can add to it this power of appeal.

Now we may admit to begin with that this criticism does touch what is a weak point in the work of the modern Churchman. He has not yet proved himself a great and successful evangelist. There has not as yet been any great religious revival upon the lines of modern Churchmanship. It has not evoked the enthusiastic response of the multitude to anything like the same extent that the other movements have done. But to admit this, and to admit it freely, is not to acknowledge the full justice of the criticism. There is something at any rate to be said on the other side. That criticism, as it is ordinarily expressed, is based partly at least upon a misunderstanding. On two points at any rate the modern Churchman can make a good defence.

In the first place, without in the least wishing to depreciate the work of other religious movements, it is only fair to say that they have not been quite so successful as they claim to have been. They have had their failures as well as their triumphs. Both the older positions have to a very large extent lost their hold upon men's minds. They do not at the present time appeal with the compelling force that once they did. They have certainly lost their hold upon what we may call the intellectual or educated classes. These have moved away from the old standpoint to an extent which is hardly appreciated. Neither the Catholic nor the Evangelical formulae, as they have hitherto been expressed, meet the needs of the educated man or woman of to-day. In both cases a certain amount of re-interpretation and re-statement are needed. And on the other hand, if we take a wider survey of modern life, we cannot but admit that traditional Christianity has to a great extent lost its hold over large classes. The power of organised religion has failed. Here and there it can still show good results, but on the whole it is a less powerful influence than it was a generation ago. The great revivals of religion which are associated with the Evangelical and Catholic movements have not left behind them the permanent results that might have been expected. Many of the startling conversions which they

have claimed have proved temporary. Sudden and striking results have not always been followed by lasting progress. There has been at least some evidence of reaction following the immediate success of their appeal.

And secondly, the modern Churchman has not failed so completely in this respect as the criticism would lead us to believe. His record may not be so apparent, his converts may not be so numerous, he may not be able to point to the same outward results, but very often the quiet influence has been deeper and the results which it has produced have been less liable to fluctuation and change. Where his message has really told it has resulted at least in a security of faith which has not been easily shaken or disturbed, and in a standard of practice not less worthy of respect and imitation. And one reason at least for this is due to the fact that the modern Churchman faces problems which the others are content to leave on one side. In tendencies which other religious teachers have only regarded with suspicion and aversion, he has seen the signs of hope and promise. The intellectual unrest through which our age has been passing was something which the Catholic and the Evangelical could only look upon as a danger to religious faith. Their only attitude towards it was one of resistance and opposition. They stood outside it altogether. They had no real sympathy with all those strivings of the human spirit. But the modern Churchman, just because he shared all this, found in it the direct working of the Spirit of God and saw the beginnings of a fuller revelation of truth to the world. In the very doubts and perplexities which men were feeling there was a gracious influence which was leading them into the presence of God. Whatever doubts may assail the world, whatever burdens may be laid upon us, whatever disasters may threaten, it is in them and not apart from them that the modern Churchman will look for the Divine message to his age. Nay, it may even be in the very breakdown of old systems of belief and practice that he will see the saving truth that will at last reconcile the world to God.

The modern Churchman has a Gospel. That is as much part of his outfit as it is part of the outfit of any other Churchman. It is a Gospel of salvation through Christ and through the presence and working of His Spirit. It is a Gospel of redemption for a fallen world, it is a Gospel of reconciliation between man and God. But to all these familiar terms he gives a larger meaning. He cannot be satisfied by the mere conversion of the individual soul from sin to grace. He cannot stop short at a forgiveness which lifts the burden from one soul while that burden still lies heavy upon the world; he dare not offer the full message of peace to a troubled spirit while the world in which he lives is still distracted by doubt and strife. That is to give all too narrow a meaning to the great terms in the covenant of reconciliation. Christ came to redeem the world and to draw men together into a great brotherhood of mutual love and service. The redeemed soul cannot know the meaning of his own salvation till he finds himself in a redeemed world. It is only there that he can be at home and at peace. He cannot offer to God the full unstinted offering of prayer and praise except in a Church no longer rent and divided, but one in which men are at length reconciled to one another in love. These at least are conditions as necessary to the full conversion of the soul as are its own personal repentance and faith. The Gospel of reconciliation means a reconciliation between class and class and between nation and nation, it means the reconciliation between the old and the new, the doctrines of the old faith and the revelation of the new light, it means the reconciliation of a divided and distracted Church into the unity which is in accordance with the mind of Christ. Towards that the saving, as we call it, of the individual soul, is a part but it is not the whole. There are many agencies of regeneration at work in the great household of God. There are many instruments of redemption all being used by the Father's hand. The work of reconciliation is going on often where our eyes are too blind to see anything but destruction and decay. God's purpose is being wrought out in ways which we might think

strange and devious. To that purpose immediate results are nothing. As often as not they are the most misleading signs. There, at any rate, we are true to the Spirit of Christ Himself, who sacrificed all hope of an immediate success in order that He might achieve an eternal victory, who, to accomplish the world's redemption, chose a sign of failure and died upon a Cross of shame, making that ever since the symbol of the Church's faith and the central reconciling fact of the world's distracted life.

THE CATHOLIC MODERNIST AND THE LIBERAL PROTESTANT.*

The Liberal Movement in the Church of England at the present moment contains within itself two different and not altogether harmonious elements. It has reached a point when it is no longer homogeneous, and it has yet to be proved whether it will be possible to hold those elements together in permanent co-operation, or on the other hand, if the present condition of the movement is but a temporary phase through which we are passing, it remains to be seen to what extent the presence of either of these elements will modify the other or how far the Liberal movement itself may be affected by the attempt to harmonise them. I say, in the Church of England, for a particular reason, not because I wish to separate theological Liberalism in the Church of England from theological Liberalism outside it, but because from our special history and circumstances the problem is likely to be more acute with us than it is

* The Editor invites correspondence in connection with the theme of this article. The issue it deals with is one of great practical importance, and is better discussed in writing than orally. Letters must be concise, and should not exceed 500 words.—Ed. *M.C.*

likely to be anywhere else, and we are more favourably situated than others are for grasping it practically and finding a working solution. But we must remember all the time that what is true on a small scale among ourselves is only an epitome, so to speak, of what is taking place throughout Christendom as a whole. Theological Liberalism has affected every branch of the Christian Church. The issues that have been raised by modern thought cut right across all the old conventional divisions. There are Liberal thinkers among the most Catholic as there are among the most Protestant bodies, and there is a sense in which Liberal theologians, to whatever branch of the Christian Church they may belong, are nearer to one another than they are or can be to the more conservative members of their own communion.

But just because the Church of England has never been a homogeneous body, just because—for good or for ill,—it has always contained within itself both a Catholic and a Protestant section in spite of every effort to the contrary, it has remained essentially and fundamentally comprehensive, the problem must be more acute for us than for others, we must be the first to feel the need of reconciling the Catholic and the Protestant elements in theological Liberalism.

The Liberal movement in the Church of England is to-day a much bigger thing than the old Broad Church school of thought. I say this without the slightest wish to depreciate the service rendered by the old Broad Churchmen, or to minimise in any way their importance. They were splendidly faithful to their trust. They kept the flag of liberty flying when it had no other defenders. They held the fort against attack from all sides. Their efforts have made it possible that a Liberal movement on a far larger scale should rise within and not without the Church of England. It is their glory and their triumph that a day should have come when from the very ranks of their opponents new adherents should be flocking in. And in passing let us notice this point for our own warning and encouragement. If the older Liberals had allowed themselves to be driven out, if

they had yielded to the demand which was made persistently enough in their day, that their position was an impossible one, and that their duty was to depart, if they had not steadfastly held their ground, and borne the charges of disloyalty, there would have been no ground for us to stand upon to-day. That should surely provide an answer to one of our own difficulties. When we are told that we have advanced so far, that the opinions that we now hold are no longer compatible with loyalty to the Church, that sooner or later we must choose between our Churchmanship and our Liberalism, that the attitude that we feel compelled to take up either to the doctrinal standards or to the disciplinary system of the Church, is one that is inconsistent with the continuance of membership or ministry within the body, then we must remember that we are the trustees of the future, that we hold the ground not for ourselves alone, but for those who will come after us, and that it will make all the difference to them, if not to us, whether we yield to that demand or resist it. It is a comparatively unimportant thing whether a few individuals remain or are driven out, but it vitally affects the whole future of the Church of England as a religious body and as a national Church, whether there is room left for the theological Liberal within the body or not. That, however, is not the issue which I propose to discuss in the present paper. My subject is not the well-worn theme of the relation of the theological Liberal to the body of which he is a member or a minister, but rather of the relation of two diverse elements in the Liberal movement to one another, and of the problems which arise out of that relationship.

For the sake of clearness we may designate these two elements in the liberal movement as the Catholic Modernist and the Liberal Protestant, but let us remember that such names are at best matters of convenience rather than of accurate definition. Each of them covers a variety of types. There are no very hard and fast lines of demarcation in the Liberal movement. So long as they serve to describe a real difference that is enough. A few sentences must be devoted to making this

point clear. The position of the Catholic Modernist is not an easy one to describe, especially for one who finds it very difficult to sympathise with it. Roughly speaking, we may say it is that of a man, who accepts the application of the strictest critical methods, both to the Old and New Testament and to the origins of Christianity and the results which follow such application, but does not see any reason to modify his attitude to that method of interpreting Christianity which has, or seems to have, the sanction of Catholic antiquity. He claims full intellectual liberty in matters of belief. He will not allow the voice of ecclesiastical authority to foreclose enquiry or to determine in advance the results which are to be reached by study. History and science must be left perfectly free to deal with all that falls within their province, and the Churchman must be free to accept their verdict without compromising his position. Even the creeds are not to be exempt from this. But, at the same time, the Catholic Modernist does not wish to surrender any of his Catholic heritage. His belief in a Catholic Church, with definite authority, with an ordered ministry, with valid sacraments, with power to bind and to loose, remains intact. In the realm of practical conduct, the Church speaks to him with the same authority. He draws the same distinction between the Catholic Church and other Christian bodies. It alone can be the home of his spiritual life. Its services and its devotions alone can satisfy the needs of the soul. It is true that the outstanding examples of the Catholic Modernist are to be found outside our own Communion. We think of such names as Loisy and Tyrrell,—and it is natural that this should be the case. The Church of Rome presents a more congenial field than does the Church of England. This—the line of less, if not of least, resistance—is the only form of theological Liberalism which is possible there, whereas, among ourselves, theological Liberalism has generally taken another line. But for all that there is in the Church of England at least, the beginnings of a school of Catholic Modernists, and it is probable, or, to put it at its lowest, it is possible, that this school may increase, both

in numbers and in importance, in the near future. Some, at any rate, of the more acute intellects of the Catholic party in our own Church, are so sensitive to the claims of modern thought that they have definitely abandoned the standpoint of the older orthodoxy and fully accepted the teachings of history and of science. They cannot stop short at a kind of modified criticism, like that of the Bishop of Oxford, which saves its Catholicism at the cost of a kind of intellectual suicide. They, on the contrary, must be thoroughgoing critics and thoroughgoing Catholics at the same time. To put it strongly, they are ready to give up a literal belief in the Virgin Birth and the Empty Tomb, provided criticism requires them to do so, but they will, at the same time, maintain the full practice of the Mass and the Confessional. It is not for me, on the present occasion, to say or even to attempt to say, how far such a position can be consistently or successfully maintained. That it is held, and held sincerely and honestly, is enough. And those who hold it are, at the present moment, among the adherents of the Liberal movement, and, for aught I know, among the members of the Churchmen's Union. But we must notice as well one effect of holding this position. It results, in many cases at any rate, not in the weakening but rather in a strengthening of the emphasis that is laid upon the claims of the Church. Ecclesiastical authority is called in to guarantee that which criticism has threatened to destroy. The ministry and the sacraments rest even more entirely upon the authority of the Church, when they can no longer appeal with the same confidence to the judgment of history. And that sacerdotalism, which, in one form or other, is an essential feature of Catholicism, assumes for the Catholic Modernist, an even exaggerated importance.

The position of the Liberal Protestant is easier to describe. His Liberalism and his Protestantism do not come into acute or obvious conflict. As a Protestant he has always sat somewhat loosely to ecclesiastical rules. He has a low estimate of Church authority. He cannot be a good Protestant and at the

same time a "good Churchman,"—in the ordinary sense in which the latter term is used. Both by instinct and by tradition he is the champion of freedom, just as the Catholic is the champion of order. Protestant Orthodoxy has never worn the same forbidding mien, nor has it used the same formidable weapons that Catholic orthodoxy has done. So far as it relied upon any external authority it found that in the Bible and in history, and when the belief in the literal accuracy of the Bible was shaken, and a fuller reading of history became possible, it was easy for the Protestant, without doing violence to any essential principle, to adjust his faith to the new conditions. Nor has the Protestant, —save under exceptional conditions,—made much of the institutions and rites of the Church. Its ministry and its sacraments, though they have been maintained and valued, have always taken a secondary place. His devotion has not centred round any particular form of worship, in the same way that that of the Catholic has centred round the Eucharist. It has not nourished itself upon the rich inheritance of the past in such a way that it could not do without it. Protestantism has been a religion of freedom. It has clung not to the letter but to the spirit. It has made little of law and much of grace. The doctrines which have occupied the largest place in Protestant theology are just those,—such as justification by faith or sanctification by the Spirit,—which have lent themselves less easily to the exact formulation and accurate definition which is the distinctive mark of Catholic theology. Above all Protestantism, in theory if not always in practice, has been anti-sacerdotal in character. It has no place for the priest. It has steadily asserted the right of private judgment and the sovereignty of the individual conscience. It has regarded sacerdotalism and a sacerdotal view of the ministry of the Church as a standing menace to human liberty both of speech and of action. So theological Liberalism which has often seemed to be the very antithesis of the Catholic conception of the Church, is equally the logical development of Protestantism. It has always been at home among Protestant communities. Its

struggle against orthodoxy has been less severe. The claim that the theological Liberal makes to freedom of interpretation is one that the Protestant, even though he does not himself join in it, is least of all others able to resist. He can only do so by denying those very truths for which his fathers have fought and died, and which are the underlying principles of his own position. Protestantism, so long as it is consistent with its own first principles, can never create for itself an Orthodoxy which will be proof against the assaults of Liberalism. On the contrary the Protestant is rather inclined to welcome a criticism which, just because it destroys so much of ancient dogma and tradition, causes him to lay an even greater stress upon those elements of faith and of freedom which have ever been the rallying cries of the battles that he has fought in the past. Orthodoxy, which is of the very essence of Catholicism is somewhat alien to the Protestant spirit; Liberalism which is to the Protestant almost a second nature becomes to the Catholic a kind of self-contradiction.

Now the outstanding feature of the present situation is that two types, as distinct from one another as these which I have tried to describe, should find themselves ranged side by side within the same movement. That is a fact which deserves our most serious attention. It is not too soon for us to consider what this situation means and how it can best be used. And we may interpret it in different ways. From one point of view —and that a very natural one—we may see nothing in this which is not matter for encouragement and congratulation. It affords striking evidence of the extent to which liberal ideas have permeated all parties and schools of thought within the Church. We are almost tempted to think that the millenium has come, and that the wolf is ready to lie down with the lamb. While I do not in any way desire to minimise the measure of success that seems to have been gained, I would sound what I believe is a necessary note of warning. If from one point of view there is reason for hope, from another the very same facts give cause for anxiety and point to a danger of misunderstanding

and disintegration. As things still are in this world, if you try to anticipate the millenium you are inviting trouble, and when the wolf and the lamb lie down together without first arriving at a clear understanding as to their mutual relations, the glowing visions of the prophet are not likely to be realised, at least by the lamb. It is the pressing duty of theological Liberals, to whatever section of the movement they may belong, to face the facts of the present situation and to ask themselves what is involved in their present alliance. Now the first fact to be realised is that the bond which unites them is mainly, if not entirely, an intellectual one. They both accept the same general conclusions on certain matters of history and on the interpretation of documents and formularies. But they are divided in ways which are at least of equal importance. Their early associations, their devotional instincts, their forms of worship are not the same. The Catholic Modernist still finds in all the rich ceremonial of the Church the natural channel of his devotion. His heart turns to those among whom he has moved before. The Protestant, on the other hand, could never feel at home amid such surroundings. His heart clings to the stern simplicity of his worship, and it is the very bareness of its external setting which is dear to him. Now with most of us the heart is stronger than the head, and the bonds of affection and old association are more powerful than those of a purely intellectual character. Convictions of the mind, however firmly they may be held, rarely become strong enough to alter the settled habits of a lifetime or to break the ties which bind us to the scenes which memory has made sacred. While that is the case, there is always the possibility that should some real crisis arise in the Church, some vital issue on which it was impossible for men not to take sides, devotional instincts would prove more powerful than intellectual convictions, one or other would feel himself to be in a false position, there would be tension within the Liberal Movement itself, and the two elements might drift apart. This is no imaginary danger. There are questions which at the present day are agitating the mind of the

Church which may at any moment precipitate such a catastrophe, and we must be prepared to meet it. So long as an attack is made upon our intellectual liberties, so long as attempts are made to fetter the movement of free enquiry, so long as the authorities of the Church try to bind upon us the old orthodoxies, the Catholic Modernist and the Liberal Protestant will fight side by side. Here they are at one, and they will passionately resist such encroachments on their freedom. But should the question at issue be of a different nature,—should it concern the relation of the Church to other Christian bodies, the recognition of their orders or ministry, the participation in their sacraments or the admission of their members to the sacraments of the Church,—then the Catholic will take one side, and the Protestant will take the other. On such questions as these there can be no compromise. The Catholic Modernist, though he is ready to stand for freedom of thought, has no wish to alter the ancient discipline and order of the Church. The Liberal Protestant though he has no wish to exclude the Catholic from the Liberal movement, cannot agree to bind himself by the rules which the Catholic recognises, or to restrict his own freedom of religious fellowship in order to conciliate the scruples of his Modernist friend. And unless I am much mistaken, events are moving so rapidly at the present time that the situation which I have indicated is certain to arise sooner or later, and sooner rather than later. That will be the crucial test for the Liberal movement.

I have no practical solution to offer. I think that if we recognise the danger, and steadily refuse to shut our eyes to it, that will be something. It seems to me, as things are at present, quite hopeless to expect that either element will absorb the other or that a policy of mutual concession can be pursued with any hope of ultimate success. I do not think that the Catholic,—so long as he calls himself a Catholic at all,—would ever agree to such relaxations of established rules as would satisfy what the Protestant considers his legitimate demands. Nor do I think it is any more likely that the Protestant would consent so to curtail his own liberty of action that it would be no cause

of offence to the Catholic. Any attempt to avert disaster on these lines is doomed to failure. The only hope that I see,—and I confess it is a bright one,—lies in the adoption by both of the largest policy of mutual toleration. While they can agree to act together for certain purposes, and to maintain the most cordial and confidential relations with one another, each must be left perfectly free in matters of religious practice. The Catholic is not to be expected to join in those efforts at reunion to which the Protestant is deeply committed. He can maintain the stringency of his own rules, but he must not attempt to bind them upon the whole Liberal movement. The Protestant on the other hand will not be expected, as a condition of co-operation, to forego his experiments in religious fellowship or to refrain from putting his own principles into practice whenever he judges that a suitable occasion for doing so has arisen. The widest possible liberty in matters of practice must be upheld if the movement is to be held together. That seems to be not only the wisdom of experience but also the teaching of all true Liberalism, No true Liberal can hesitate over such an application of his own principles. The very discipline of exercising and maintaining such a toleration will of itself strengthen and develop our own Liberalism, and the triumph of such a policy, when it comes, will provide the strongest of all arguments to justify and confirm our faith in theological liberalism itself. It may be that a time will come for a more complete fusion. Catholic and Protestant will have learnt in this atmosphere of freedom to understand each other better and to grow together both in faith and worship, until they have attained, without sacrifice of essential principle on either side, to a fuller expression of their common religious life in which all that is best both in Catholic order and Protestant freedom has become at last reconciled and harmonised.

THE VALLEY OF DRY BONES.

An Appreciation and a Rejoinder.

The readers of the June *Modern Churchman* will be so much in sympathy with the greater part of the arresting article entitled The Valley of Dry Bones—"the incomprehensible pile of lumber;" "the remarks made by those who know how to address Bishops;" "the comments made by members of his own college serving with the forces on the amiable generalities" of the Religious Correspondent of the *Times*; the complaint of the "loss of the ideal of service," and of the significant fact that our apologists for the most part "leave Christian Ethics severely alone"—that criticism may seem ungracious. It is not meant to be so; it would be difficult to find a paper in which so much that wants saying has been so well said. But it appears to me that in some respects the author sees the clerical office out of perspective; that he magnifies it unduly, expecting from those who hold it the assertion of claims which they are not entitled to put forward, and the discharge of functions which they are neither competent nor qualified to perform.

It may be said, not without truth, that, under the conditions of modern life, the clergy are becoming to an increasing extent the private chaplains of the devout. That this is so is very much to be regretted. But it should also be said that the experience of a clergyman who tries to be more is seldom encouraging. The devout are scandalized; the indevout are indifferent; he falls between two stools. His position may be compared to that of a Professor of Chinese in a European University. No one is in the least interested in his subject. This is not to say that the Professorship is useless. It may serve as a nucleus for the Chinese studies of the future. But, here and now, the lectures are a mere form.

In his admirable article on "Preparation for the National Mission," Canon Wilson lays just stress on sins of omission; and, in particular, on the indifference of Churchmen to social and economic reform. His words are true and timely: the preacher who is silent on these questions is deaf and blind and dumb. But I find it impossible, with R.E., to blame the pulpit for a certain reticence as to sex morality. The Commandments and the Catechism speak in plain, though general, terms. The preacher will do well to follow their lines; not avoiding the subject merely because it is unpleasant—this would be an evasion; but recognising the danger both of suggestion and of that *morosa delectatio* which is never far from the discussion of such subjects: "thou shalt lie in wait for his heel." In particular cases more detailed treatment may be called for; but for the general pulpit, which addresses itself to mixed congregations, made up of persons differing in age, sex, temperament and experience, such treatment is as unsuitable as the discussion of technical questions of speculative or historical theology. Very much more harm than good would be done were the "foolishness of preaching" let loose on these topics. In the great majority of cases it is better that such instruction as is desirable should be given by parents or teachers, or in certain cases by doctors, than by the clergy, who do not possess *ex-officio* the capacity, the tact, or the technical knowledge required.

A "director" of some experience tells me that his "direction" frequently takes the very sensible shape of advising the penitent to consult a competent medical man. Whatever may be thought of the practice of "direction"—and here I confess myself an unrepentant Protestant—such "ghostly counsel and advice" will be generally approved.

On questions on which a difference of opinion exists it is even more undesirable that a clergyman, as such, should take upon himself to lay down the law. He is in all probability very imperfectly acquainted with the subject, in which neither his training nor his knowledge of the world qualify him to act as a judge. In practice, where people may be presumed to be acting in good faith, a prudent adviser will be slow to disturb them. Where this is not so, he will state principles, leaving those concerned—who must know the facts in a way in which he cannot—to apply them to the matter in hand. He will remember the extent to which the ethical quality of an action is determined by its circumstances; and that there are circumstances under which the wisest course is, to the best of one's judgment and conscience, to make one's own law. Such circumstances are no doubt rare, and Jowett's maxim, that "we should be suspicious of scruples of conscience which good men do not share," may be transposed; we should be suspicious of any course of conduct which runs counter to the use and opinion of good men. But exceptions can, and do, occur.

The complaint that in the National Church "there are almost as many opinions as there are teachers," seems to be based, however unconsciously, on a static, or mediaeval, conception of the Church. Neither at the Vatican nor at Lambeth shall we find an infallible theological enquiry office. A Church that claims to possess one has entered on the fatal path of charlatanism; "we know in part." The unity of the Church is one of direction, not of creed-content. Its standards are relative, and have an element of time-and-place-stuff. We do not want to be for ever tinkering at them, or to revise them in the sense of the *Daily Mail*. But we approach them as historical documents bearing upon them the stamp of their age. The precise formula of the Trinity or of the Incarnation, the detailed account of the manner in which Christ entered into or left this world—such questions having nothing to do with religion; no man, or body of men, is qualified to pronounce upon them. And the demand for "clear and definite teaching" is to be viewed with suspicion: "They see not clearliest who see all things clear." For Christianity is a historical religion, and has a past from which it cannot be dissociated. It is also, like all great religions, a philosophical religion; it brings us up against the eternal problems of the world and of life. Men of a non-speculative habit of mind can, and do, pass over these aspects of Christianity lightly; nor are they to be blamed for this; we are not all cast in the same mould. But they must be resisted when they would impose their own limitations on others; nor must it be thought that these great questions can be settled definitely and out of hand. For they grow under our eyes. We live in a world of universal movement; and neither the process of thought nor that of things can be arrested—all things flow.

These results may appear negative. If they were, it does not follow that they would be useless. When we can say what a thing is not, we have

at least narrowed the field of enquiry, and excluded answers that lead nowhere. I do not think, with R.E., that either their "intellectual attainments" or their "social distinction" are very serious hindrances to the work of the clergy. There are, of course, exceptions; but, to the rank and file,

Cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator

applies. With his statement, however, that they shew a "terrible tendency to form a caste;" that they are "out of touch with the lives of the people;" and that they have "no conception of the opinion entertained of them by the great mass of Englishmen, educated and uneducated;" I find myself more in agreement than I could wish. While the assertion that they "have failed to afford any real help at a time of greatest need," though too unqualifiedly and indiscriminatingly put, has sufficient truth in it to make us all extremely uncomfortable. "Ephraim feedeth on wind," says the prophet; our Church assemblies, from Convocation to ruri-decanal chapters, multiply words without increasing sense. Whether the substitution of *John Bull* for the *Church Times* would mend matters is another question. My own criticism of the former journal is not that it is "unworthy of a Christian nation"—this might be said, with greater point, of the latter—but that, no doubt, with a sound business instinct, it has brought vulgarity to the level of a fine art. "Why, sir," said Johnson of old Mr. Sheridan—"Sherry is dull; naturally dull. But it must have taken him a great deal of pains to become what we now see him. Such an excess of stupidity, sir, is not in nature."

The war marks the end of one age, and the opening of another. The world may be worse, or better; but it will never be the same again. For all of us particular and local standards are passing ever into universal; and the great questions of life are presenting themselves with an importunity which will tolerate neither evasion nor delay. The State and the Church—which are in the last resort one—civil and religious society alike, must meet them; an at least provisional solution, moving on the lines of actual thought and life, must be found. This—or a breakdown of civilization: the choice is between the two.

One of the first objects of the National Mission is to make provision for the religious demands of our soldiers after the war. "At what point," asks R.E., "does the Church touch their lives? What has she to offer them?" These are grave questions: and the danger of living in a fool's paradise with regard to them is graver. For, as to what the demands of the men will be, we find the strangest assumptions. One authority assures us that they are clamouring for the Confessional and for the substitution of "Mass" for Mattins; another that they will accept nothing but old-fashioned Puritan orthodoxy; a third that they are secularists of the type of the *Clarion*; a fourth that the contrast between Belgian piety and Anglican aridity is leading them in numbers to the Church of Rome. Before we accept any, or all, of these large and loose statements, let us be sure that we are not counting our chickens before they are hatched; and ask whether the average British soldier can be said to make any distinctive demands upon religion at all? His experience during the last two years has certainly been such as to lead him to reflection—to make even the thoughtless think and the heedless feel. But whether it will make him think and feel on our, or any other, conventional

lines is a different matter. It does not follow; and we may find ourselves upon a false track if we assume that it will.

There is not—and there is now less than ever—any such thing as a distinctive soldier-mentality. The army, as we see it, is the nation in arms; and the mind of the soldier is that of his class and time. To remember this is to be secure from much misconception. No doubt the states of mind described are found among our citizen-soldiers, as they are found among the mixed civilian population from which the men are drawn. You enlist a "server" from a Ritualistic church, or a "deacon" from a Baptist chapel, or a secularist Park orator; he brings his prejudices and prepossessions with him. So that chaplains and special correspondents of decided views find what they wish, and are prepared to find; the more so because like goes to like, and their reports, while in fact the creatures of their preconceptions, are confirmed by their experience; the testimony is misleading; but it reproduces what they have heard and seen. The reason why it is misleading is that it is, however unconsciously, selected testimony. The sectaries described are exceptional; and even *their* angles become less angular under the discipline of the barrack room and the camp. In the army, as wherever men congregate, there is a tendency to discourage crotchets. The climate is unfavourable to them; they flourish in conventicles, but wither in a larger air.

The Englishman on whom these bracing influences have left their mark has, as a rule, two religions; one which he holds in fact; and one which he is supposed, and perhaps supposes himself, to hold. The latter which is that of his church or chapel or Sunday school, he takes at second-hand and superficially. He probably neither disavows its practices, though he observes them sparingly, nor consciously rejects its beliefs. But he is frankly neither interested in nor well acquainted with them; they are like a Sunday coat which is put on for Sunday, and put off till Sunday comes round again. Yet, convention as it is, it is a useful convention; and stress should be laid on the adjective as well as on the substantive. It links him with the past; it is an opening into the unseen world. An obstructed opening—perhaps; but somehow or other the light shines through.

The other religion is one of consequences rather than of creeds, and of conduct rather than of observance. Its laws are invariable, there is no getting away from them; and their source is not a transcendental lawgiver, but the nature of things. It has a strong element of fatalism; what will be will be, and complaints are useless. It has also a certain ethical idealism; one must act on the square; keep trust; endure pain and privation stoically; die, when the time comes, like a man. It is quick to detect unreality; those who live near the soil and Nature see through pretence instinctively. And they take the mixed content of life more easily than the world of convention does. They have no formulated theory of immortality; for them, though they would not put it in this way, life is a link in a system; and they do not think—they would resent the supposition—that this system, though, as a whole, its working escapes them, was made either at random or to no purpose. A great Victorian poet, whom stupid people of our own time think they have got beyond, expresses this conviction:—

"Thou wilt not leave us in the dust:
Thou madest man, he knows not why;
He thinks he was not made to die—
And Thou hast made him; Thou art just."

Now this outlook on life has in it the makings of a very admirable and a very useful religion; a religion which will not, perhaps, fit in with any of our conventional orthodoxies as they stand; but which contains values which they either do not contain, or contain imperfectly; and which will enter into combination with their best elements. They have something, and something of importance, to add to it—the Father-God, and the Mediator-Man Christ Jesus; it has something, and something of importance, to take away from them—their indifference to falsehood and their acquiescence in wrong. The difficulty in the way of their mutual understanding is the over emphasis laid on the traditional factor in current religion. The religious world accentuates this factor to an excess, and will not hear of its being regarded as secondary or non-essential. The Athanasian Creed is an example; and there are others very much more burning which it is unnecessary to name. We shut our eyes to the fact that these things *have* become obsolete. They are part and parcel of R.E.'s "incomprehensible pile of lumber;" and their very supporters are driven to explain them elaborately. To unsophisticated people these elaborate explanations seem elaborate insincerities; and insincerity is the thing above all others of which they are intolerant and which they resent. A religion which has the promise of the future must at all costs keep clear of this fatal alliance. Such a religion will have three leading characteristics:—

(1) It will embrace, not exclude. It will make short work, *i.e.* of denominational differences: "I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas," and the like. These differences belong to the province of the infinitely little; it will not concern itself with them.

(2) It will be inseparable from a far-reaching social and economic movement. It will lay stress, a stress hitherto undreamed of, on the altruism which is of the essence of the Gospel: the one sinner for whom it will have no use and no toleration is the unbrotherly man.

(3) It will be part and parcel of an increasing life and civilization. It will welcome new knowledge, new perceptions, new sympathies and aspirations, new openings into the Beyond. "I am come that they may have life, and that they may have it more abundantly;" and life is a limitless thing.

It is improbable that the end of the war will bring with it any very sudden or abrupt changes. "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation;" things do not come about in this way. What we may expect is rather an increased development of existing tendencies; more impatience of social and economic contrasts; more criticism of tradition, secular and religious; more intolerance of the merely conventional and of shams. If we think that religion as it exists among us is free from these evil growths, we deceive ourselves. It is not. And it has much, very much, to fear from them. It possesses piety, benevolence, zeal. But it is deficient, lamentably and palpably deficient, in veracity and in the sense of the actual. The rest will not save it; it is on the recovery of this veracity and of this sense of the actual that its future depends.

ALFRED FAWKES.

Ashby St. Ledgers.

A WHITSUNTIDE SERMON.*

By the Rev. Dawson Walker, D.D., Principal of St. John's Hall, Durham.

"Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God."—*Ephesians iv.* 30.

Those who read their New Testament with careful attention can hardly fail to remark one general feature that is characteristic of its various writers.

It is their frequent and familiar habit to enlarge on some particular fact of sacred history, or some particular aspect of Divine truth; and then, to pass at once from the language of affirmation to that of warning—to set forth in words of marked and almost sombre gravity, the responsibility which God's good gifts impose on those who receive them, and the corresponding risk of heedlessness or neglect.

This example on the part of these writers is one that we may do well to follow in our celebration of the Feast of Whitsuntide. It is pre-eminently a festival of joy—an occasion of thanksgiving and triumph.

Critical opinion may vary in its estimate of the happenings of the first Whit Sunday. Some regard the record, with all its details of rushing wind and tongues of fire, as a literal narrative of historic fact. Others may suspect some process of legendary growth in picturesque details. But no one, I think, with any reputation for historical judgment or critical acumen to lose, would deny that on that day of Pentecost a great thing happened, the essence of which was this:

That a body of men and women, who, in the estimation of the world would pass for very undistinguished, very ordinary and humble men and women, were taken possession of, were

* Preached in Durham Cathedral, Whit Sunday, 11th June, 1916.

filled by a power quite distinct from themselves, coming on them from outside and from above—and that in consequence of being possessed and inhabited by this higher supernatural power, they were enabled to plan things and to do things, which, with their own unaided capacities, they would have been quite incapable of doing; in fact, in virtue of this higher and divine strength which came upon them, not only were their own lives transformed and uplifted, but they, a few poor despised provincials, inaugurated the beginnings of that movement, which not only captured and transformed the Roman Empire in which they lived, but will, ultimately, we believe, convert the kingdoms of this world into the "Kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ."

What Whitsuntide, in fact, recalls is this: That God is not remote from us, but is with us; that He will take us, with all our weakness and incapacity, will inspire us with His Divine Life, will enable us with His Divine Strength. And so regarded, there can hardly be a happier anniversary than this. It is the very charter for all true progress—the surety for all lofty ideals to the whole human race.

But the efficacy of this rich gift of God depends not only upon Him who gives, but on those who receive.

It is in no sense a benefit that is unconditional and absolute. We can receive; but we can also reject. We can close our eyes to the light; we can steel our hearts rigidly and firmly against all the gracious and invigorating influences that God is ready to pour out upon us.

And this, unfortunately, is no abstract possibility. Throughout the general religious history of mankind, and not least through the history of Christianity, there runs a tragic record of opposition and of failure—of renewed and repeated occasions when the illuminating and inspiring influences of God's Holy Spirit have been checked and hindered by resistance from the side of man.

The Apostolic writers, from the first, were keenly alive to this sad contingency. St. Peter, in pronouncing judgment on

Ananias, puts the reproachful question: "Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?" To his Thessalonian converts, St. Paul addresses an appeal to "Quench not the Spirit." And, in the words I read for our text, he exhorts a still wider circle of readers to "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God." The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews passes from the language of appeal to that of severe and stern prediction:—

> "As touching those who . . . . were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, and then fell away, it is impossible to renew them again to repentance."

These words, in each instance, are addressed, not to the outside unbeliever, but to professing Christians. And to address such words to such people is no mere pulpit platitude, no outburst of religious rhetoric. For if the history of religion makes one fact clearer than another, it is this: that it is not on the part of the outcast and the ignorant, but on that of the professedly and eminently religious that the strongest opposition and the bitterest hostility have been displayed to the outpoured influences of God's Holy Spirit.

So far as Christianity is concerned I think a survey of Church history would prove the point beyond possibility of contradiction. But there is one instance—familiar enough to us all and concerned rather with the origins of Christianity than with its subsequent growth—an instance which it is always worth while to keep in our remembrance.

We are familiar enough with the phrase "the Scribes and Pharisees." The very utterance of it serves to open before our eyes a long vista of scenes in the Gospel history; repeated occasions on which our Lord performed various miracles of love and healing; at times, in order to perform His miracle, deliberately breaking through some traditional rule, or long-established custom. And, on each occasion, He was confronted by carping criticism from these Scribes and Pharisees—a criticism that was in every case mean, querulous, and utterly contemptible. Their criticism of Him and His deeds was varied and many sided—but, it surely reached its supreme

height of concentrated animosity, when, unable to deny that He cast out devils, they said "He casteth out devils through Beelzebub the chief of the devils."

But the term "Scribes and Pharisees" has still a further association for our minds. It recalls to us the 23rd chapter of St. Matthew—the record of the occasion on which our Lord delivered a reasoned and comprehensive judgment on them, their principles of action and their resultant practice. And I think we may say, without exaggeration, that no body of men has ever been submitted to a more searing, scorching verdict, than this recorded judgment of Jesus on the Scribes and Pharisees.

So severe, indeed, is its invective that I believe some writers on ethics have found the Saviour's words unjustifiably harsh, and have characterized them as the outpourings of vindictive animus. We here, I presume, should rather regard them as the final and unimpeachable verdict of Divine judgment, and should read them with corresponding reverence and awe.

There is no need to recall the passage in detail. We remember its outstanding features:—

> "All their works they do for to be seen of men . . . they love the chief place at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues . . . they compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is become so, they make him twofold more a child of hell than themselves . . . they tithe mint and anise and cummin and have left undone the weightier matters of the law . . . they outwardly appear righteous unto men, but inwardly are full of hypocrisy and iniquity."

But who were the men on whom was poured this unmeasured denunciation—this pitiless reproach?

They were no wild wanton reprobates, no outcasts from civil and religious society. They were the official religious leaders; they were the ecclesiastics of their day. They were the men of whom St. Paul said that they had "a zeal of God but not according to knowledge." They were men of high and worthy religious ancestry. Men who, if not beloved, were, at any rate, respected and revered by the people at large. How could they deserve so grave a castigation? What was the gravamen of the charges brought against them by Jesus?

*It was on the one hand traditionalism. The Judaism they represented was bound hand and foot by the past. It preferred precedents and authorities to the living conscience and present religious experience. It built, with the most scrupulous piety, sepulchres for the older prophets, and it stoned, with rigorous ferocity, their modern representatives. It revered the past and it hated our Lord.

He charged them, too, with formalism—the spirit which exalts minutiae of ritual, and details of church order, and is correspondingly oblivious to great moral and spiritual issues. And formalism, such as this, can never long be dissociated from the other fault with which He repeatedly charged them, that of hypocrisy.

If any proof were needed of the justice of His strictures they supplied it themselves only a few days afterwards. We remember how, on the morning of the Crucifixion day, after a night of torture and insult, Christ was led by them and their followers to the praetorium, and they themselves entered not in that they might not be defiled. They were intent on committing the greatest crime in history—the crime at which the whole world has shuddered ever since. But they paused at Pilate's threshold—because they came across an ecclesiastical rule. They were utterly unprincipled, yet absolutely scrupulous; they were wholly sincere, yet entirely unrighteous and completely perverted.

It has been said by a recent writer—not a captious assailant, but a Bishop of our own communion,—that in their attitude towards our Lord, the Jews were supreme examples of ecclesiasticism, extreme and deplorable exponents of the ecclesiastical temper in religion. Another Bishop—the Bishop of Oxford—has recently lamented the sad change of meaning in the adjective "ecclesiastical." It ought to mean "fraternal;" it ought to indicate the happy state of brotherhood in which members of the *ecclesia* are linked together. But to-day when

* For the substance of this and the following paragraph, I am indebted to an article in the *Modern Churchman*, May, 1916, p. 48 ff.

men speak of ecclesiasticism, they normally mean a temper the reverse of brotherly. They mean a mental habit that is sincere, perhaps, but always subtle and tortuous; they mean a meticulous scrupulosity about things which are generally unessential, and sometimes trivial.

And so far as this adjective indicates some such mental attitude, it is not confined to official ecclesiastics. It is the temper of mind against which all Christian people need to be strongly on their guard. It is the disposition that deserves, when developed to its logical issues, every word of the castigation bestowed by our Lord upon the Scribes and Pharisees. It is the disposition of those who, when God's Spirit is shedding light in the world, will not see; who, when the very breath of God's own life is stirring and reanimating the whole fabric of our life, will neither listen to its message nor submit to its control. It is in fact, the sin against the Holy Ghost, the sin that shall not be forgiven either in this world or in that which is to come.

The things that were written aforetime were written for our learning. We are living in an age of destruction and of reconstruction. God will not leave us to ourselves. His cleansing life-giving Spirit has surely work to do. The very thought of being possessed and used by Him, for His great ends, is the loftiest to which our minds can soar.

But the privilege involves its risk—a risk to which we in our environment here are peculiarly exposed. We are the heirs of ancient traditions; the very stones of our churches and our homes are witnesses of an older system, with venerable rules and formulae, consecrated by all the memories and sanctions of the past.

Let us pray that while valuing and treasuring what is good in this heritage of ours, we may still be receptive of all new truth that God would teach us; let us pray that, being the sons of God we may be led by the Spirit of God; let us pray that we may never—either now or at any future moment of His manifestation—"grieve the Holy Spirit of God."

THE OXFORD CONFERENCE.

Towards the end of the last century one who had considerable opportunity of observing our Western civilisation was daring enough to write: "The nineteenth century will be known in the history of mankind as the age of the mechanical forces; the twentieth century will be known as the age of the moral forces." Daring as the prophecy was, the opening years of the twentieth century seem to be justifying it. The war which convulses Europe to-day appears to be on the surface the most mechanical war in which the nations have ever engaged, yet it is essentially concerned with moral rather than with material issues. The great social and educational problems which are pressing more and more urgently for solution in our modern State are mainly—not economic in the one case or intellectual in the other—but moral.

Moreover, the matter is being seriously debated in many quarters as to whether the Christian ethic, beautiful and attractive as it appears in many of its forms, is really strong enough to shape the best type of civilisation of which human conditions admit. Many patriotic persons are convinced that to-day not vague and visionary idealism which appeals to the emotionalists and leaves the masses untouched, but a practical system of moral discipline is what the nations need.

The Conference Committee of the Churchmen's Union has therefore been wisely guided in selecting ethics, and especially Christian ethics, as the theme of the Oxford Conference to be held on August 21—25. For those who propose attending the Oxford Conference, it may be of service to indicate the general order in which the subject will be considered.

On the Monday evening Professor Percy Gardner, in his Presidential Address, will introduce it.

On the Tuesday morning papers will be read on Conscience and Authority, and will undertake to answer such questions

as: What is conscience? How far are its judgments valid? What is the relation between Conscience and external authority? Must the teaching of Christ be accepted because it appeals to the human conscience or because His teaching is supported by the Divine Authority of His Person? Miss Dougall, the authoress of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*, *Christus Futurus*, *Absente Reo*, and other thoughtful and helpful volumes, will contribute one of the papers dealing with this theme.

On the Tuesday evening some modern attacks on Christian ethics will be considered. The subject will be introduced by Professor Caldecott, of King's College, London.

Wednesday will be devoted to studying the relation of the ethical teaching of Christ to human society. Here very important issues arise. Was Christ's teaching merely an *Interims-ethik*, intended for and only practicable in a world which was on the brink of a cataclysmic judgment which would utterly destroy human society, but deliver a few elect and other-worldly souls to enjoy a spiritual and transcendental existence, or is it essentially applicable to ordinary human conditions and normal men and women? Dr. R. B. Tollinton, the historian of St. Clement of Alexandria, and Dr. G. H. Rendall, formerly Vice-Principal of Liverpool University and Headmaster of Charterhouse, will treat these questions. In the evening the thorny subject of International Relations will be introduced by the Rev. J. M. Thompson, whose writings on New Testament critical and historical matters are conspicuous for their courage and lucidity.

On Thursday morning the Conference will consider the practical question as to how far the ethical teaching of Christ admits of development and demands extension and re-adjustment to modern conditions. This raises, but in another form, the question of authority—the authority of ecclesiastical and civil regulations. Is their authority absolute or is it relative and determined by the end for which they were instituted? Under what circumstances may they and ought they to be

modified or nullified? The Rev. Alfred Fawkes, the brilliant exponent of various aspects of Modernism, will contribute one of the papers on this occasion.

On Thursday evening the Rev. C. H. S. Matthews, Vicar of St. Peter's-in-Thanet, and formerly Vice-Principal of the Brotherhood of the Good Shepherd in the Australian bush, will deal with the duty of the Church and of the individual Christian in the matter of social reform. Mr. Matthews is a forcible and pungent writer, and his hearers are likely to be moved even if not convinced. With this meeting the Conference will conclude its deliberations.

If Dean Henson's statement in *The Faith and the War* is correct, that Christianity stands to gain "by the new concentration of mind on its moral implications, for in these is its genuine originality disclosed," then such studies as the Conference proposes to undertake should prove profoundly helpful. No better book than Canon Rashdall's *Conscience and Christ* could be found as an introduction to the Conference papers and discussions, and we venture to recommend it as a text book to those who though perhaps not ethical students, yet propose to attend the Conference meetings and perhaps to take part in its debates.

The Holy Communion, as on former occasions, will be celebrated every morning. At Evensong addresses will be given by the Rev. Hubert Handley, Rev. Dr. Skrine, the Rev. Fergus Wood, and Canon Rashdall.

The chairmen of the different meetings will be the Rev. Dr. Morrison, Canon Rashdall, Dr. Tollinton, and Mr. W. B. Gordon. Mr. Handley, as heretofore, will act as chaplain.

Mrs. Major, Mrs. Moxon, Mrs. Reith, and Miss Nussey will constitute the House Committee, and all domestic arrangements will be in their capable hands.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

THE ANNUAL GATHERING IN LONDON.

The Annual Gathering of the Churchmen's Union in the metropolis on July 6th, was well attended. The proceedings opened with the celebration of Holy Communion in the historic church of St. Sepulchre's, Holborn, at which there were many communicants. The Vicar celebrated, being assisted by the Revs. Cavendish Moxon, John Gamble, and Hubert Handley. An impressive and inspiring sermon from the text, "Come forth, Lazarus," was preached by the Rev. Hubert Handley.

At the Public Meeting, in the Hall of Sion College, Professor Percy Gardner presided, and briefly introduced the three speakers, the Rev. Canon Streeter, the Rev. H. D. A. Major, and Cyril Norwood, Esq., Litt. D.

The first speaker dealt with the National Mission, and the way to render it effective. He laid great emphasis upon a policy of courageous and many-sided experiment. The second speaker, while expressing gratitude for the earnest efforts of the laity in attempting Church Reform, affirmed that effective action could only be brought about under the leadership of the episcopate and priesthood. Those who claimed to impart and to be the recipients of the Holy Spirit in a very special manner in which the laity were not, ought to exhibit that Holy Spirit, "Who spake by the Prophets," in the courage and sincerity of their lives, and by their prophetic policy of subordinating institutions and regulations to moral and spiritual aims. The third speaker dealt with "The Church in the Immediate Future." He urged the whole-hearted and self-sacrificing co-operation of the Church and of individual Churchpeople with the great social and educational movements in the nation.

The Rev. Hubert Handley's sermon and the addresses of Canon Streeter and Dr. Cyril Norwood will be published in full in the August *Modern Churchman*.

At the Annual General Meeting of members of the Churchmen's Union, Mr. W. B. Gordon presided. The Annual Report was received and the accounts passed. Professor Percy Gardner, Litt.D., LL.D., F.B.A., F.S.A., was unanimously re-elected President; Sir Richard Stapley was re-elected Honorary Treasurer; Mr. Warner, F.C.A., was re-elected Honorary Auditor, and the following were elected members of the Council:—Mr. P. H. Bagenal, Mr. F. C. Channing, Revs. W. A. Cunningham Craig, J. A. Dodd, C. W. Emmet, J. Gamble, Canon Glazebrook, Mr. W. B. Gordon, Revs. H. Handley, Canon Foakes-Jackson, H. D. A. Major, R. G. Milburn, J. L.

Milne, Dr. Morrison, Dr. Cyril Norwood, Canon Papillon, The Dean of Peterborough, Canon Rashdall, Mrs. Reith, Revs. W. C. Roberts, Dr. H. G. Rosedale, T. F. Royds, C. J. Sharp, C. R. Shaw Stewart, J. E. Symes, J. M. Thompson, Rev. Dr. Tollinton, Revs. J. R. Wilkinson, Fergus Wood, Miss Younghusband.

After some discussion, which however was very temperate and restrained in view of the difficulties of the situation, the proposed Amendments to the Constitution and Rules of the Churchmen's Union were carried. On two points there seemed to be a desire for alteration. (1) It was felt that while the Churchmen's Union should consist of members of the Church of England, yet the deliberate exclusion of all who were not Anglicans was not in harmony with the spirit and policy of the Union. It was proposed that such, although they might not become full members and be allowed to vote and discharge official functions, should yet, as honorary members, be welcome to attend our gatherings and to share in our discussions. It is hoped that the new Council will provide for this in a constitutional way.

(2) The feeling was expressed that the Council, although somewhat reduced in numbers, is still unworkably large. It was pointed out that frequent meetings of so large a body are impossible, and that rapidity of decision and action are equally impossible. It was proposed, therefore, that the numbers of the Council should be reduced to seven. This was not carried, but there were some who voted against it who felt the force of the criticism as to the size of the Council, but judged that the better remedy would be not to reduce its numbers, but to appoint a small and able Executive Committee to discharge many of its functions, the full Council only being assembled for the consideration of matters which require considerable discussion and deliberation. We hope the new Council will consider this proposal seriously.

The authorities are to be congratulated on the excellence of their arrangements.

Yorkshire Branch.—Yorkshire members of the Churchmen's Union are much indebted to the Rev. Hubert Handley, who most kindly came north at the invitation of the officers of the Yorkshire branch, and gave three addresses on "Largeness and Life for the Church," on June 19th, 20th, and 22nd, at Harrogate, Ilkley, and Bradford, respectively. Two of our active Yorkshire laymen, Mr. P. H. Bagenal and Mr. W. B. Gordon, although at much inconvenience to themselves, presided at the meetings which were of a public character. On each occasion the speaker gave an admirable address full of interest, humour, and inspiration. A compressed report of these addresses would be quite inadequate, and fail altogether to do justice to the speaker's thoughts, and the language in which he clothed them. They dealt

with the essentially religious character of our movement, and its national value and significance at the present time.

We could wish that addresses of this kind might be delivered through the length and breadth of the land. The audiences at first would not be large, but at least those who attended such gatherings, and that larger body who read the reports of them would realise, and be helped by the realisation, that there is developing an ideal of Church life which while reverent and loyal, is yet uncompromising in its demand for Christian unity, Christian sincerity, Christian simplicity, and Christian service.

Excellent reports, thanks to the provision of our press secretary, appeared in the local press in each centre.

Oxford Branch.—A well-attended meeting of the Oxford branch and friends was held on Wednesday, June 21st, in the Senior Common Room, New College, by kind invitation of Dr. Rashdall. After tea, Dr. Rashdall himself introduced the subject of "State, Church, and Conscience," dealing both subtly and lucidly with the authority and claims of each, of course with special reference to the position of the conscientious objector. The discussion was opened by the Chairman, Professor Gardner, and was continued by Miss Dougall, and Messrs. Bass, Edwards, Thompson, and Emmet. The whole meeting was a good preliminary to the Summer Conference, when we hope to thresh out this and kindred subjects as fully as possible.

The Churchmen's Union and the National Mission.—The Council has issued the following statement for publication.

The Council of the Churchmen's Union loyally accepts the decision to hold a National Mission, in the hope that it means a real effort on the part of the Church to learn how it may best discharge its duty to all sections of the nation, and to show that it has room within its borders for all men of goodwill who are working to advance the kingdom of God.

Among other steps in this direction it endorses the effort to bring together in Fellowship Groups, or otherwise, men of all lines of thought for joint prayer and discussion, and urges members of the Union to avail themselves of all such opportunities.

The Council is also confident that members of the Union will do all in their power towards directing the Mission to large and living issues.

The Rev. C. W. Emmet, West Hendred Vicarage, Steventon, Berks., has been appointed as secretary to receive the names of liberal clergy who are willing to undertake missions, and who require suitable missioners, and to put them into communication with one another, so far as is consistent with Diocesan arrangements.

CORRESPONDENCE.

*** The Editor regrets that limitations of space have prevented the publication of a number of letters.

SOME PRACTICAL AND URGENT REFORMS.

SIR, *To the Editor of the* MODERN CHURCHMAN.

On the occasion of the delivery of his charge to clergy and wardens at Leominster recently, the Archdeacon of Hereford said that, while he had no authority for stating it, he was sure that any experiments made with the idea of improving the services of the Church, or of making them more attractive, would be looked upon with a lenient or favourable eye. I see that his brother, the Bishop of London, has just told some audience that a soldier, back from the front, attending his parish church, remarked "Same old dry stuff! I'm off to the Y.M.C.A.!" If this soldier's experience be more or less typical, it is time that some practical experiments were made to secure greater interest in our Church services, and with this object in view, I desire to throw out a few suggestions, which, if commonplace and somewhat unoriginal, may be helpful to some.

My suggestions are of two kinds—those which the parochial clergy could not well adopt without authority, and those which might be considered as coming under the "experiments" referred to by the Archdeacon.

Among the first I would place a very drastic editing of the Psalms and Lectionary. In the Abyssinian Church it is said that the whole Psalter is recited at a funeral! We mercifully extend this recital over 30 days. But the method in both cases is mechanical, deadening, and meaningless. Let us, of course, leave the Book of Psalms as we find it in the Bible, but let us restrict their liturgical use only to those Psalms which are of moral and spiritual value. For our present mechanical and formal method tends to degrade the more spiritual and elevating parts down to that which is simply Jewish and almost barbaric in character. There is a very great need for a reformed Lectionary, in which more of the Apocrypha—and, dare I add, other writings—might find a legitimate place. Certainly some of our Hexateuchal lessons—especially some of those in Lent—might be changed for the nobler and more edifying passages from the Prophets. To make these more intelligible, a committee of experts might prepare an amended edition by making use of the many brilliant suggestions of recent scholarship. How these fine writings would then thrill and inspire! Again, noble and beautiful as the Prayer Book Canticles are, why should not occasional use be made of others drawn from Isaiah, Habakkuk, &c. The Venite would be all the better restricted to the first six verses. Why should we daily sing about the provocation and the temptation in the wilderness? The prayers want simplifying, and all repetition should be strictly divided. There are still Cathedrals, I believe, that will pray for the King thrice and use the Lord's Prayer no less than five times at what is practically one Morning Service! Surely the wonder is that so many—not that so few—still attend our troglodyte services with their "vain repetitions" and "much speaking!"

Under my second suggestion I would say, first, do not hesitate to substitute a suitable for an unsuitable lesson like 1 Cor. vii. Here, again, it is ridiculous to give our Sunday congregations every seventh chapter of the New Testament. It is all so unintelligent and mechanical! Next, preface

the reading of a lesson with a short exposition, explaining that which is obscure or drawing attention to that which really makes it "a lesson to be learned by heart." Thirdly, leave out those awful "cursing" Psalms which suggest to folk that either we never mean what we sing, or if we do mean anything we should be thoroughly ashamed of ourselves for singing such dreadful sentiments. I have episcopal sanction not to use them at Brownyard, and in such otherwise beautiful Psalms as the 69th and the 137th, we sing the Gloria after verse 23 in the former, and after verse 6 in the latter, thus mitigating something of the terrible impressions such truly horrible sentiments contained in Ps. 69, 28, and Ps. 137, 9, must give even to the most thoughtless of our worshippers. What justification can there possibly be for any sane and decently-minded persons singing such shameful imprecations as "Let them fall from one wickedness to another, and not come into Thy righteousness," and, "Blessed shall he be that taketh thy children and throweth them against the stones."

Fourthly, read the Commandments without their comments, as the ten "Words" were doubtless originally without them. These comments whether from Exodus or from Deuteronomy are omitted in the Gospels, and by St. Paul. Moreover, the crisp, concise, "Thou shalt not covet," is largely spoiled when we proceed to place our neighbour's wife after his house, and alongside of his ox and his ass; Thou shalt not make *to thyself* any graven image; Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain; Remember to keep holy the Sabbath day; Honour thy father and thy mother; Thou shalt not bear false witness—are, it seems to me, made all the more forcibly emphatic, when omission is made of such unreal conceptions of things under the earth, of the world's creation in six days, and of the land which the Lord our God is supposed to have given, *e.g.*, to poor Hodge, who rather tills than owns his acres.

Fifthly, omit all the Glorias save one in those parts of the 119th Psalm which are used from Day 24 to Day 26, and so avoid an undue familiarity with sacred formulae. Sixthly, when the ante-communion is read with matins, begin it immediately after the Benedictus, and so avoid the utterly unnecessary repetition of two creeds within a few minutes, and much other unnecessary duplication. When the Litany is said with matins, it might close with the Kyrie, and in any case it might immediately follow the Apostles' Creed after the mutual salutations and the three Collects for the Day, &c. The Benedictus will, on both these occasions, have just been sung, and so the hymn usual at this juncture of the service, could be omitted or transferred to the commencement of the whole service. Seventhly, after the third collect (when neither the Litany nor Ante-communion is used) we might occasionally have special and short intercession services (like our War Intercession) but rigidly avoiding the repeating of anything already used in the earlier part of service, and of course instead of, not in addition to, the appointed State prayers, &c.

In all this the object is brevity, simplicity and variety, and the avoidance of monotony and wearisome repetition. My own plan during the last two years at Bromyard, a plan that our people would resent now being upset, is as follows:—Every Sunday Holy Communion at 8 a.m. On the first and third Sundays in the month, Morning Prayer to the Prayer of St. Chrysostom,

Hymn, Sermon, Hymn, St. Chrysostom, and Grace. On the second and fifth Sundays, Morning Prayer to Apostles' Creed with Salutation and the three Collects and Litany (the invocatory part at least always sung) to Prayer of St. Chrysostom, Hymn, Sermon, S. Chrysostom, and Grace. On the third Sunday a Choral Celebration precedes at 9-45, the Morning Prayer at 11, and on the first Sunday a Low Celebration at 12 follows Morning Prayer. On the fourth Sunday, Morning Prayer to the end of the Benedictus, during which the clergy have proceeded to the altar, there after "Let us pray," to begin the Ante-communion service. After the sermon I very rarely use the Prayer for the Church Militant. All very contrary to Rubrics, no doubt! But who among us can afford to throw stones in this matter?

Lastly, may I put in a word which I believe is far more necessary than most of my suggestions. The impression too often given at our services is that of gabbling and of formalism. Why not say our prayers, say them in our natural voice. At any rate, do not let us intone or even monotone everything. We say everything simply and naturally up to "O Lord open Thou our lips," including the Amens. After the third Collect, *i.e.* the State Prayers, etc., we sing, monotone, or intone all that is between (except the Lessons, etc., of course). Here, no doubt, I may be charged with a certain inconsistency, and I will gladly submit to the impeachment. My aim is not to be consistent—some statesman described consistency as the hob-goblin of little minds,—but to give my people a reverent, bright, hearty and devotional service, free so far as possible from monotony and repetition, with such variety both as to form and method which shall make my fellow-worshippers say "It is good for us to be here," and "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord." Let our sermons be short, direct, not only to the point in regard to conscience and heart, but also not unsatisfying to the modern mind and imagination. My own aim is to compress all, without hurry, into an hour or an hour and a quarter, for I prefer letting my people go away before they are wearied, and that, like Oliver Twist, they should ask for more.

FRANCIS E. POWELL.

Bromyard Vicarage, Worcester, May 31st, 1916.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION TO MILITARY SERVICE.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

I should not venture to write to you on this subject, to which, important as it is, you have already devoted so many pages, were it not that I have felt myself alternately in agreement, as I have read, with some part of the view of almost all your contributors, and I think it is likely that many of your readers have shared my experience. And I am saved from the conclusion that my sympathies are shallow and my opinions unstable only because it seems to me that the views which have been expressed are by no means as inconsistent as appears at first sight, and can be—I would even say, must be—combined in a larger view if any presently satisfactory results are to be obtained. I believe the first step towards this end is the recognition that we

are confronted here by two problems—an ethical and a political—and that difficulties are bound to follow upon any failure to separate them. Further, it is the political question which presses at the moment; and statesmanship must seek to do justice to the strong points of both sides in the controversy.

It is incontestable that, as Canon Rashdall wrote in his article, we do not, as a rule, allow the plea of a good conscience to justify a breach of the law. A man may, with the utmost sincerity, hold views antagonistic to the institution of private property, and society does not interfere; but if, under present conditions, he puts his theories into operation to the hurt of his neighbours, it does. To say this is to concede that liberty of conscience is not an absolutely fundamental principle of even a democratically-organised state, but only one of several principles which may come into conflict. And I am therefore bound to agree with Dr. Rashdall that in this instance it *may* be the duty of the state to try to compel conscientious objectors to serve. As Mr. Gamble said, it is a matter of political expediency.

With Mr. Gamble's careful discrimination between conscience and reason, I am very largely* in agreement. Perhaps "conscientious" objector is a name which fails to bring out all the details of the position. But, anyhow, we cannot be blind to the fact that many of these objectors could willingly admit his distinction without in the least modifying their attitude. They would say that they had convinced themselves, by their reason, that active participation in warfare was wrong for them; and that they were then impelled by their consciences to act according to this judgment.

At the same time I cannot but agree with those who wish the state to respect conscientious scruples of this kind, and who (incidentally) complain of the treatment which, as it appears, many men have suffered at the hands of the Tribunals or of the military authorities afterwards.

So I come back to my plea that we should distinguish between (i.) the right or wrong of the conscientious objection to military service, and (ii.) the desirability of the State's recognising such an objection.

As to (i.), I do not believe that the conscientious objector is right *in his judgment*; but, given the judgment, I believe that he is right *in his conscience*. To use the phraseology of Canon Rashdall, he is subjectively right and objectively wrong. Now it needs no argument to prove that we cannot be content with such a position for anybody. We must desire for every man that he may be objectively as well as subjectively right. But honest mistakes are not uncommon, nor are they peculiar to the present time. And when the case arises of a judgment which is not in accord with the facts, I cannot help thinking that it is usually better to act upon a mistaken judgment with a clear conscience than to sacrifice internal to external correctness. It seems to me that the former choice does at least give evidence of the greater moral earnestness, and it may well be that in the long run this moral earnestness is of more value to the country than any outward act of conformity would be.

* Not entirely, however. I think that my conscience constitutes itself the custodian of those rational judgments of right and wrong which, by frequent repetition, tend to become intuitive; and thereafter tries to teach as well as exhort. When I am rationally convinced that such an intuitive judgment is mistaken, and decide to disregard it in future, I am at first aware of a slightly uneasy conscience. I suggest that this fact is inconsistent with the complete separation of functions which Mr. Gamble maintains.

But there is one important respect in which the present situation is unusual. Conscientious scruples generally lead to one's adopting the less comfortable of two alternatives, and on this occasion it is not so. (I do not overlook the aspect of the matter put forward by V. de B., but I am convinced that to the ordinary soldier the risk of war is a more serious matter than the treatment which most conscientious objectors are called upon to undergo. To say nothing else, it involves a far greater feeling of uncertainty as to the future of those dependent upon him.) If a man tells me that he has a conscientious objection to staying in bed after 4 a.m., and acts accordingly, I believe he is sincere; if, however, he conscientiously objects to getting up before mid-day, I am inclined to be suspicious. And so we are brought to the real crux of the question (ii.); for there can be no doubt that the *easy* treatment of honest objectors would encourage dishonest people to "discover" objections which had not troubled them before. So in attempting to settle the political question we have to do justice to two demands coming from opposite sides, and at first sight inconsistent with one another. *And both demands are fair.* On the one hand the Bishop of Lincoln, Dr. Clifford and others, say to us, "If you pretend to recognise conscientious objection to service, do it properly." On the other, the military authorities remind us, "You must not do anything to encourage the dishonest shirker."

May I, in conclusion, offer two or three suggestions towards a solution?

(*a*) Would it be unreasonable to require evidence in every case that the conscientious scruple had been felt before the war?

(*b*) As the objection is directed against taking another person's life rather than risking one's own, could not work be assigned which was attended by the ordinary amount of military risk? I make this suggestion with no malicious desire to punish the sincere objector, but in order to remove from others the incentive to copy his example unworthily. For this reason I believe the plan might actually be welcomed by some of those who were honest in their scruples; while those who were not so would no longer seek for an exemption which merely deprived them of the opportunity of "hitting back."

(*c*) It is true that in many cases non-combatant service has been refused, and Canon Rashdall has admitted that those who act thus often have logic on their side. But I should like to ask his leave to modify the admission. I would prefer to say that they have logic on their side *so far as they go*; but that they do not follow their logic to the bitter end. If it is true that Red Cross work may prolong the war, it is equally true that the most ordinary civilian work may do the same. The man who makes boots will, by continuing at his employment, set free an additional man to make boots for the Russian army. And if it is urged that this is a *reductio ad absurdum* of logic, it may perhaps be allowed; but it serves its purpose all the better on that account. For it proves that for the conscientious objector to be entirely logical is impossible. My last suggestion therefore would be that it should be made plain that although exemption from combatant service might be granted, exemption from non-combatant service on the ground of conscience would not be obtainable under any circumstances whatever.

C. F. Russell.

Harrow-on-the-Hill.